

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action that was mailed on December 24, 2008. Claims 1, 3-10, and 12-15 were pending in that action and all claims were rejected. With the present response, claims 1, 3-10, and 12-14 are amended, claims 26-37 are new, and claim 15 is unchanged. Consideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully solicited in light of the following comments.

#### **35 USC §112 Rejections**

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-10, and 13-14 under 35 USC §112. In particular, the Examiner stated that the claim limitation of compliant with Common Language Specification is indefinite because the standard may change. With the present amendment, the limitation of compliant with Common Language Specification has been removed from all of the claims. Applicant respectfully contends that at least as amended that the claims satisfy the requirements of §112. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

#### **35 USC §102 Rejections**

##### Claim 12:

Claim 12 was previously an independent claim. With this amendment, it has been re-written such that it is dependent upon claim 1. The claim has also been amended to include the further limitation that “the addition configures the managed code execution environment to accept a new resource input.” This amendment is well supported throughout the application as originally filed such as in the specification on page 19, lines 20-24 that states that “[i]n accordance with one embodiment, the system is configured to enable a developer to add information to the list of valid values as necessary to configure the system to accept new or different resource inputs.”

Claim 12 recites in part “receiving from the developer an addition to the plurality of managed code resources.” On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the limitation is disclosed by “Figure 6.15, p. 119” of Craig Utley, “A Programmer’s Introduction to Visual Basic .NET,” SAMS Publishing, 2001 (hereinafter “Utley”).

The cited sections of Utley describe a process of accessing a database from a Windows application. Applicant does not believe that this discloses receiving from the developer an addition to the plurality of managed code resources. Regardless, as was

previously mentioned, the claim has been further narrowed to recite that “the addition configures the managed code execution environment to accept a new resource input.” Even if the cited sections of Utley disclosed the previous claim limitation, Applicant respectfully contends that it certainly does not disclose the claim as amended. For example, the process shown in Utley does not configure any environment to accept a new resource input. The process in Utley only shows a developer using existing resources.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully contends that Utley does not anticipate claim 12. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 15:

Claim 15 recites in part “providing the developer with a collection of resource identifiers that include at least two identifiers that each identify a different language version of what is essentially the same resource.” On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the rejection of claim 15 “is the same as addressed in the rejection of claim 12.”

Applicant would like to highlight that there is no limitation in claim 12 that is even similar to the claim 15 limitation quoted above. In rejecting claim 12, the Examiner cited several sections of Utley. Applicant is not sure which if any of those sections that the Examiner contends discloses the claim 15 limitation. Applicant would also like to highlight that MPEP 706.02(j) states that “[i]t is important for an examiner to properly communicate the basis for a rejection so that the issues can be identified early and the applicant can be given fair opportunity to reply.” That section of the MPEP also states that the Examiner should provide the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s).

In the present case, the Examiner has not clearly communicated the basis of rejection of claim 15. Applicant accordingly respectfully contends that he has not been given a fair opportunity to reply. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner clearly communicates his basis of rejection for claim 15.

Also, regardless of the lack of clarity of the rejection, Applicant respectfully contends that the claim 15 limitation is not disclosed by Utley. Utley only shows

resources in the Visual Basic.NET programming language. Utley never shows a resource in the Visual Basic.Net language and an equivalent resource in another language.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully contends that Utley does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 15 and that Utley therefore does not anticipate claim 15. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

### **35 USC §103 Rejections**

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-10, and 13-14 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Utley. As is discussed below, Applicant respectfully contends that the claims include limitations and combinations of limitations that are not disclosed by Utley and that are not obvious in view of Utley. Because of this, Applicant respectfully contends that the claims are patentable.

#### Claim 1:

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of “utilizing a computer processor that is a functional component of the computer to verify.” This amendment is supported for example by computer 110 and its processor 120 in FIG. 1. Claim 1 has also been amended to include the limitation of “automatically inserting, based at least in part on the selection, the one of the plurality of managed code resources into a programming code.” This amendment is supported for example on page 18, lines 20-24 of the specification that states that “[u]ltimately, the developer will select one of the entries from menu 430. Selection will cause a resource key name, string and/or value to be automatically inserted into the code at an appropriate location.”

In rejecting the claim 1 collection of resource identifiers, the Examiner stated that it is disclosed by the index shown in FIG. 6.15 on page 121 of Utley. As can be seen from the Utley figure, the Utley index has a text box where a user inputs a search parameter and a results box that shows the results of the search. Applicant does not believe that the Utley index discloses the claimed collection of resource identifiers. Regardless, as amended, claim 1 recites automatically inserting, based at least in part on the selection, the one of the plurality of managed code resources into a programming code. Even if the Utley index did disclose the claimed collection of identifiers, Utley

does not disclose automatically inserting anything into a programming code based upon the selection of any of the items shown in its index.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully contends that claim 1 is patentable over Utley. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 3-10 and 13-14:

Claim 3-10 and 13-14 are each dependent upon claim 1. Applicant respectfully contends that the claims are patentable at least based on their dependence upon patentable independent claim 1. Each of the claims has also been amended to include new limitations. Applicant respectfully contends that these new limitations are not disclosed by or obvious in view of Utley, and that the claims are thus patentable based on the merits of their own limitations.

Claim 3 has been amended to recite that the collection of resource identifiers comprises a collection of methods and properties. This is supported for example in the specification on page 17, lines 4-9 that states that “[a]ccordingly, in accordance with one aspect of the present invention, when a developer enters a resource class and follows it with an activation key, a list (e.g., a drop-down menu) is automatically provided showing the related accessible methods and properties.”

Claim 4 has been amended to recite that the activation key is selected from the group consisting of a period, a space bar, and a left parenthesis. This is supported for example in the specification on page 16, lines 1-5 that states that “[i]n accordance with one embodiment, the activator key is a period (.). In accordance with other embodiments, the activator key is a space bar, the left (open) parenthesis, or some other key call.”

Claim 5 has been amended to recite that providing a collection of resource identifiers comprises providing the collection of resource identifiers in the form of a drop-down list, and wherein stopping on one of the resource identifiers in the drop-down list for a predetermined amount of time causes additional information to appear in a pop-up window proximate to the drop-down list. This is supported for example in the specification on page 15, line 26 to page 16, lines 11 that states in part that “[i]n accordance with one embodiment, navigating (i.e., scrolling) or typing through a drop down list and stopping (e.g., for a predetermined amount of time) on one of the available

selections will cause additional information to appear in a pop-up window proximate to the drop-down menu.”

Claim 6 has been amended to recite that the collection of resource identifiers comprises a collection of key names, strings, and values. This is supported for example in the specification on page 15, lines 21-25 that states that “[f]or example, identifier information (i.e., key name, string and/or value information) that corresponds to available resources are displayed to the developer for selection and statement completion.”

Claim 7 has been amended to recite that automatically inserting comprises automatically inserting one of the key names, one of the strings, and one of the values into the programming code at an appropriate location. This is supported for example in the specification on page 18, lines 20-24 that states that “[u]ltimately, the developer will select one of the entries from menu 430. Selection will cause a resource key name, string and/or value to be automatically inserted into the code at an appropriate location.”

Claim 8 has been amended to recite that the resource value that corresponds to a selected one of the collection of resource identifiers is within a pop-up box, and that automatically inserting comprises automatically inserting the value into the programming code. This is supported for example in the specification on page 17, lines 11-14 that states that “[i]n accordance with another embodiment, highlighting one of the key names then initiates provision of the related string value (e.g., within a pop-up box).” This is also supported for example by element 436 in FIG. 4 and in the specification on page 18, lines 16-24.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite the step of keying in a precursor to a resource identifier. This is supported for example in the specification on page 17, lines 19-22 that states that “[w]ithin the coding area at location 425, a developer has keyed in “FORM11”, which is illustratively a precursor to input of a resource identifier.”

Claim 10 has been amended to recite that providing information comprises information that corresponds to the precursor. This is supported for example in the specification on page 17, lines 22-28 that states that “[f]ollowing the precursor, the developer has keyed in a period (.), which is illustratively an activator key that initiates a response from StringRes tool 206 in the form of a drop-down menu 430. Menu 430 illustratively contains resource information that is valid for the corresponding precursor

entry.” Claim 10 has also been amended to recite that the consecutive order of the steps is first providing, second utilizing, and third automatically inserting. This is supported for example in the illustrative embodiment shown in FIG. 5.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite that the collection of resource identifiers are displayed in a graphical user interface window that is positioned within a coding area. This is supported for example by FIGS. 3-4. FIG. 3 shows a coding area 302. FIG. 4 shows a collection of resource identifiers 430 positioned within coding area 302 (shown but not labeled in FIG. 4).

Claim 14 has been amended to recite automatically displaying the collection when a cursor is positioned at a location of information availability. This is supported for example in the specification on 16, lines 12-28 that states in part that “[i]n accordance with one embodiment, a developer is provided with options on the design program interface that enable him or her to adjust the status of the automatic delivery of resource information to Auto, Manual or Disabled. When set to Automatic, a resource list automatically appears when an activator key is pressed.”

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully contends that claims 3-10 and 13-14 are patentable over Utley. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

### **New Claims**

#### **Claims 26-28:**

Claims 26-28 are new claims that are dependent upon independent claim 15. Claim 26 is supported for example by computer 110 and its processor 120 in FIG. 1. Claim 27 is supported for example by FIGS. 3-4 that show a pop-up window 430 (FIG. 4) in a coding area 302 (FIG. 3). Claim 28 is supported for example in the specification on page 18, lines 20-24.

Applicant respectfully contends that the claims are patentable at least based on their dependence upon patentable independent claim 15. Applicant also respectfully contends that the claims include limitations are not disclosed by or obvious in view of Utley, and that the claims are thus patentable based on the merits of their own limitations. Applicant respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Claim 29:

Claim 29 is a new independent claim. All of its limitations are well supported throughout the application as originally filed. The step of receiving from a developer an indication of a desired managed code resource is supported for example in the specification on page 12, lines 16-23. The step of communicating a resource request to a resource manager is supported for example in the specification on page 12, lines 23-27. The step of displaying a collection of resource identifiers is supported for example in the specification on page 15, lines 16-25. The step of receiving from a developer a selection is supported for example in the specification on page 15, lines 21-25. The step of automatically inserting is supported for example in the specification on page 18, lines 20-24.

Claim 29 includes some limitations that are at least similar to limitations that have been previously discussed in regards to other claims, and claim 29 is patentable for the same or similar reasons. For example, claim 29 includes an automatically inserting step that is similar to the automatically inserting step mentioned in the claim 1 discussion.

Claim 29 also includes several new limitations that have not been previously presented in any of the claims. For example, claim 29 recites communicating a resource request to a resource manager. Claim 29 also recites displaying a collection of identifiers that each correspond to the key name and the string. Applicant respectfully contends that these limitations are not disclosed by or obvious in view of Utley.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully contends that claim 29 is patentable over the cited reference. Applicant respectfully requests that the claim be allowed.

Claims 30-37:

Claims 30-37 are new claims that are dependent upon claim 29. Claim 30 is supported for example in the specification on page 12, lines 16-21. Claims 31-34 are supported for example in the specification on page 15, line 28 to page 16, line 5. Claims 35-37 are supported for example by FIGS. 3-4 and in the specification on page 16, lines 5-11.

Applicant respectfully contends that the claims are patentable at least based on their dependence upon patentable independent claim 29. Applicant also respectfully

contends that the claims include limitations and combinations of limitations that are not disclosed by or obvious in view of Utley. Applicant respectfully requests that claims 30-37 be allowed.

**Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, and 26-37 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Accordingly, consideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully solicited. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /christopher l holt/  
Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844  
Suite 1400  
900 Second Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CLH:NKB:rkp